DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 047 JC 790 054

TITLE Legislative Commission's Subcommittee on the community College Division of the University of Nevada System. Report to the Legislative Commission.

INSTITUTION Nevada State Legislature, Carson City. Legislative Commission

PUB DATE Aug 78

NOTE 41p.; Appendices have been deleted due to irreproducibility

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Organization; Community Colleges; Educational Finance; Faculty Development; *Governance; *Junior Colleges; Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; *State Legislation; *Statewide Planning; University Administration

IDENTIFIERS Assembly Resolution 44 (Nevada (1977); *Nevada

ABSTRACT

This legislative report complies with Nevada's Assembly Concurrent Resolution 44 which mandated the study of the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System to determine: (1) if the Community College Division should be separated from the University system; (2) the future needs of Nevada residents for community colleges; (3) whether the present resources of community colleges were being used to greatest advantage; and (4) whether community college facilities should be expanded. The inquiry, which consisted of campus site visits and five days of meetings at which regents, administrators, and students provided testimony, revealed that while the legal basis existed to statutorily separate the two systems, such a radical organizational move would be premature; that there was a need for the reinstitution of the central office of president of the Community College Division; that the community college system had benefited from strong community support; that transfer problems between two- and four-year institutions had been alleviated by the University System Articulation Board; and that the community college's original goals were still viable. The need for additional college capital facilities was not demonstrated. The report also provides a legislative history of the community college system in Nevada. (MB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164047

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION'S SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Chancellor--Univ. of Nevada System

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

JC 790 054

August 1978

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 44—Assemblymen Hickey, Howard, Chaney, Jeffrey, Rhoads, Price, May, Kosinski, Vergiels and Horn

FILE NUMBER....124

ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION—Directing the legislative commission to study the community college division of the University of Nevada System.

WHEREAS, The community college division of the University of Nevada System fills a vital educational need for many Nevada residents; and

WHEREAS, The rapid growth of the community college division has led to differences of opinion regarding suitable locations for community colleges, the administration and organization of the division and other matters; and

WHEREAS, The legislature believes that a study of the community college division may resolve such differences of opinion and ensure that the division continues to fill the educational needs of Nevada residents; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada, the Senate concurring, That the legislative commission is hereby directed to study the community college division of the University of Nevada System to determine:

1. If the community college division should be separated from the University of Nevada System;
2. The future need of Nevada residents for community colleges;
3. Whether the present resources of community colleges are being used to the greatest advantage; and
4. Whether community college facilities should be expanded or whether further expenditures should be made;

and be it further

Resolved, That the legislative commission submit a report of its findings and any recommendations for appropriate legislation to the 60th session of the legislature.

19 77

REPORT TO THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

To the Members of the Legislative Commission:

This report is submitted in compliance with Assembly Concurrent Resolution 44 which directed that the Legislative Commission study the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System to determine if the Community College Division should be separated from the University of Nevada System, the future need of Nevada residents for community colleges, whether the present resources of community colleges are being used to the greatest advantage, and whether community college facilities should be expanded or whether further expenditures should be made.

In the conduct of its assigned inquiry, the subcommittee held 5 days of meetings and visited community college campuses in North Las Vegas, Elko and Reno. At these meetings, university Regents, administrators, students, and other individuals interested in the development of Nevada's community colleges provided testimony to the subcommittee. Their contributions to the subcommittee's work are appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Assemblyman Thomas J. Hickey
Chairman

Senator James I. Gibson
Vice Chairman
Senator Norman D. Glaser
Member
Senator William J. Raggio
Member
Senator Gary A. Sheerin
Member
Assemblyman D. Roger Bremner
Member
Assemblyman R. Ian Ross
Member
Assemblyman Nash M. Sena
Member
Assemblyman John Serpa
Member

Carson City, Nevada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1. Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 44, 59th Session of the Nevada Legislature (1977) directing the Legislative Commission to study the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System. 1

2. Report of the Legislative Commission. 2

3. Summary of Recommendations. 3

4. Report to the Legislative Commission of its Subcommittee Studying the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System 5

I. Introduction. 5

II. Nevada's Community College System 7

III. Subcommittee Methodology. 17

IV. Subcommittee Findings and Conclusions 21

A. Organization of Nevada's Community Colleges. 21

B. Community College Facility Needs. 27

C. The Utilization of Community College Resources 31

D. The Future Need for Community Colleges. 33

Appendix A--Correspondence between Legislative Commission and Board of Regents 38

Appendix B--Legislative Counsel Opinion No. 48 on "Legislative authority to establish governing board for community colleges" . . . 43

Appendix C--Community College Master Course File and Articulation Procedures 47

* *

LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION

Senator Keith Ashworth
Senator Richard H. Bryan
Senator Margie Foote
Senator James I. Gibson
Senator Norman Ty Kilbrecht
Senator William J. Raggio

Assemblyman Eileen B. Brookman
Assemblyman Joseph E. Dini, Jr.
Assemblyman Lawrence E. Jacobsen
Assemblyman Paul W. May
Assemblyman Donald R. Mello
Assemblyman Robert E. Robinson

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The subcommittee finds that, while the legal basis exists to statutorily separate the Community College Division from the University of Nevada System, making such a separation, at this time would be premature. The subcommittee feels that such a radical organizational move, at this point, while not as costly as indicated to the subcommittee by those opposed to separation, would not be in the best interests of Nevada's educational system. In light of strong, negative testimony on the Regents' handling of community college affairs, the subcommittee reaffirms the importance of community college education in the State of Nevada and recommends that the Board of Regents take strong, positive actions to relieve the apprehensions of those who feel that the community colleges are being treated as a "stepchild" of the two universities.

2. The subcommittee recommends that the Board of Regents reinstitute the central office of president of the Community College Division. The subcommittee feels that the recommendation of Tadlock Associates, Incorporated that a full-time staff officer reporting to the chancellor with specific responsibility for coordinating community college matters does not provide sufficient independence and stature for the Community College Division. The subcommittee recommends that a president, having direct access to the Board of Regents in a manner similar and equal to the presidents of the University of Nevada at Reno and the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, be appointed to head the Community College Division. The subcommittee feels that the present system of three community college presidents does not provide for sufficient cohesiveness and independence for the Community College Division.

3. The subcommittee recognizes that an endeavor such as a community college system benefits from strong community support. One of the methods of obtaining this support is to use interested members of the community, who are not actively teaching or involved in the community college, to observe the functioning of the community college and to transmit the findings of their observations to the Board of Regents. The subcommittee feels that the Board of Regents should develop necessary mechanisms, whether it be local advisory boards, statewide advisory boards, or a committee of the Board of Regents, to solicit both community advice and support.

4. The subcommittee finds that sufficient information and data have not been advanced to clearly demonstrate the need for additional community college capital facilities. The subcommittee feels that additional facility requests should be even more rigorously questioned in light of the slight decline in 1977-78 community college enrollments as displayed in Table 2 (page 18).

   Additionally, the subcommittee endorses the "shared facility" concept as developed by Tadlock Associates, Incorporated. The subcommittee feels that greater use of existing facilities, whether they be publicly or privately owned, should be rigorously explored prior to the commitment of any additional funds for community college capital improvement projects. Aware of the problems in obtaining vocational-technical facilities, the subcommittee recommends that the community college explore the feasibility of joint investment with the school districts in the construction and/or acquisition of space for these purposes. Such joint investment could include the acquisition of vocational-technical equipment and supplies by the Community College Division, with building and space acquisition the responsibility of the participating school district. Such an arrangement could permit the community colleges to acquire vocational-technical teaching space during both the evening and the daytime hours.

5. The subcommittee agrees with university officials that the work of the University System Articulation Board in the development of a master course file has done much to alleviate transfer problems between the community college system and the two universities. The subcommittee is encouraged by the efforts that have been made to integrate community college course work into Nevada's higher education delivery system and feels that this successful integration is an important reason for maintenance of the existing unified community college - university organizational structure.

6. The subcommittee recognizes that the community college system has become an integral part of the state education system and feels that the original goals under which the Community College Division was established are still viable. The subcommittee feels that the statistics outlined in this report--enrollment figures, the amount of dollars allocated for community college operations and the amount of dollars made available for community college capital improvements--demonstrate legislative support and the public's acceptance of the community college concept. The subcommittee has confidence in the ability of Nevada's community colleges to successfully educate Nevada citizens.

I. INTRODUCTION

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 44, 1977 Session of the Nevada Legislature, acknowledged that while the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System fills a vital educational need for many Nevada citizens, the rapid growth of the division has led to differences of opinion regarding suitable locations for community college campuses and regarding the administration and organization of the division. In response to these differences of opinion, the legislature, through A.C.R. 44, directed the Legislative Commission to study the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System to determine if the Community College Division should be separated from the University of Nevada System, if Nevada residents have a future need for community colleges, if the community colleges are using their present resources to the greatest advantage, and if Nevada's community colleges should be expanded.

This wide-ranging study direction grew primarily out of the debates of the 1977 Legislature which saw legislative deferral of proposed new community college facilities at Fallon, Henderson, and in the West Charleston area of Las Vegas and legislative approval of Executive Budget recommendations to reduce the staff capabilities of the central administrative budget for the Community College Division. During the legislative session, community college and university officials and concerned citizens strongly urged that the legislature approve additional community college physical facilities, financed from the federal slot tax rebate, in several Nevada locations. Uncertain as to the need for these additional facilities, the legislative money committees deferred the proposed projects and requested that both the University of Nevada System and the state Public Works Board undertake a study regarding the need for additional campuses and develop a long-range plan for the expansion of the community college program. The money committees specifically requested that the state Public Works Board undertake a feasibility study of developing community college campuses adjacent to high school vocational-technical programs.

While the Executive Budget recommended the new capital facilities, it also recommended that the number of personnel supporting the central administration of the Community College

Division be drastically reduced with the separate appropriation center for community college administration being abolished. The proposal recommended that the positions of Community College Division president and administrative secretary be transferred to the system administration (chancellor's office) budget. This recommendation was based on the state Budget Division's belief that the Community College Division was becoming "another layer of bureaucracy" and had been unable to adequately supervise the operations of the various campuses. The money committees agreed with the recommended staffing reductions, but they did not concur with the proposal to merge the operating support for the Community College Division's president's office with the operating support for the chancellor's office. Instead, the money committees recommended, and the legislature agreed, that a separate appropriation identity be retained for the president's office for the Community College Division and that the Board of Regents be directed to establish one or two business centers for the business related functions of the various divisions of the University of Nevada System.

Following the legislative session in June 1977, the Board of Regents decided not to renew Dr. Charles Donnelly's contract as president of the Community College Division and acted to discontinue the position of president of the Community College Division. This action also included the initiation of the procedures necessary to elevate the existing three community college campus executive vice presidents to presidents and to provide that they report directly to the chancellor in a manner similar to the presidents of the University of Nevada Reno (UNR) and the University of Nevada Las Vegas (UNLV). In taking this action, it was the Board of Regents' expressed intent that the Community College Division's presidents function as "a joint or collective executive in cooperation with the chancellor on matters which are division-wide."[1] In July 1977, the Legislative Commission took formal action to convey its surprise to the Board of Regents over the board's decision to abolish the position of president of the Community College Division. In response, the chairman of the Board of Regents, Mr. James L. Buchanan, II, indicated that the decision to discontinue Dr. Donnelly's contract as president of the Community College Division was a personnel decision within the prerogatives and responsibilities of the Board of Regents and that the decision to abolish the position of president of the Community College Division was an expression of the majority

---

[1] Regents' bylaws, article 6, section 6.

of the Board of Regents' desire to work much more closely with the three Community College Division executive vice presidents than had been the case in the past.[2]

Against this background of controversy over both the need for additional community college facilities and the organization of the Community College Division, it is appropriate to detail the history of community college education in Nevada.

II. NEVADA'S COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

In the fall of 1967, the Elko Community College, with strong community support, was formed to offer 2-year vocational and general education programs to the residents of northern Nevada. Some 430[3] people attended the fall quarter, with courses being offered in business and office, agriculture and industry, engineering, economics, law enforcement, general education and adult education.

In February of 1968, Governor Laxalt, a strong proponent of the community college idea, requested that the Thirteenth Special Session of the Nevada Legislature appropriate $96,500 in state funds for a pilot project for community colleges in Nevada, with $50,000 of this amount being earmarked for the Elko effort. However, instead of approving the requested appropriations, the legislature adopted Assembly Bill 22, "An Act relating to education; establishing a pilot project for community colleges; directing further study of their feasibility generally; and providing other matters properly relating thereto."

Approved by the Governor on February 26, 1968, Assembly Bill 22 designated the Elko Community College as a "pilot project to assist in determining the feasibility of establishing community colleges generally throughout this state" under the guidance of the board of trustees of the Elko County School District and the superintendent of public instruction. Further, the measure directed the state Department of Education to submit to the

---

2 Copies of this correspondence are contained in this report as Appendix A.

3 Nevada Legislature; Joint Meeting of Ways and Means Committee, Senate Finance Committee, Assembly Education Committee, and Senate Education Committee; Meeting Minutes; Testimony of Eugene Voris; February 7, 1968.

1969 session of the legislature a feasibility plan to create "throughout the state or in suitable areas thereof as the study may reveal, area community colleges or vocational-technical centers."

In May, Howard Hughes announced a gift of $250,000, half earmarked for the support of the Elko Community College and half allocated to the state for a study of the need for community college education in Nevada. The study, under the direction of the superintendent of public instruction, was completed in December 1968, by the Arthur D. Little Company, Incorporated.

The Arthur D. Little report, "Recommendations for Community College Education in the State of Nevada: A Report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction," recommended "that the State of Nevada develop a comprehensive and coordinated program of community college education including transfer, occupational-technical, continuing and general education, and remedial education, including a system of counseling, placement and guidance."[4] Organizationally, the Little study indicated that "the educational issues and problems involved in community college education are sufficiently complex to justify a separate board of control"[5] and advocated that Nevada organize as a single community college district under the direction of a single community college president administering multiple campuses, each with a local advisory board, throughout the state. The study proposal further recommended the creation of three community college campuses--Las Vegas, Reno, Elko--and forecast a 1980-81 full-time equated (FTE) enrollment of 10,408, an annual operating budget of $12,088,000, and cumulative capital needs to that date of $45,500,000.

In his message to the 1969 session of the legislature, Governor Laxalt indicated that the community college program recommended by the Little report, though desirable, was simply out of the state's financial reach. Instead, the governor counseled that the state "move slowly" and make certain that existing programs at the universities and in the public schools not be jeopardized.

---

4 Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Recommendations for Community College Education in the State of Nevada: A Report to the Superintendent of Public Instruction; Dec. 1968; p. S-4.

5 Ibid, p. S-6.

The governor's budget recommended an appropriation of $1,000 for each FTE student in attendance at the Elko Community College to a maximum of 250 students per year. The recommendation specifically visualized that the state would provide the operating funds, while the local community would provide the necessary educational facilities.

Additionally, in 1969, Governor Laxalt proposed that the Board of Regents accept responsibility for development of a community college system in Nevada. Specifically, the governor proposed that a Community College Division be established as a fourth division of the University of Nevada System (UNS) and that the UNS "provide sufficient funds to establish a central administration for the development of a statewide system." The Board of Regents agreed to create a Community College Division if the legislature appropriated funds for its operation and the chancellor was instructed to develop a proposed plan of organization and basic program plan for the proposed new Community College Division.

The legislature proved receptive to the funding proposal and approved an operational budget for Elko Community College of $150,000 for 1969-70 and $175,000 for 1970-71. The approved budget was based on $1,000 per FTE student, to a maximum of 150 in 1969-70 and 175 in 1970-71. Additionally, the legislature, partially in response to an Attorney General's opinion that the Board of Regents is responsible for all tax-supported college level education in Nevada, approved Assembly Bill 659 which transferred the administrative responsibility for the Elko Community College to the University of Nevada Board of Regents.

By March 1969, the Board of Regents had approved a program statement which established the basic objectives of the Community College Division during 1969-71 as the continuation of "the operation of the Elko Community College in order that the program there is stabilized and future growth and development is planned so that the appropriate functions of a community college will be realized" and the establishment of a central administration of a Community College Division of the UNS to "do the necessary planning and curriculum development to provide community college programs elsewhere in Nevada."[6]

---

[6] "A Program Statement for Operation of the Community College Division of the University of Nevada System: 1969-1971," Approved by the Board of Regents, March 6, 1969.

During the 1969-71 time period covered by the program statement, administration of a federally funded skill training center for minorities, disadvantaged, and hard-core unemployed persons in southern Nevada was undertaken; Dr. Charles Donnelly, with extensive experience in community college education in Michigan, was appointed to head the Community College Division; 58 acres known as the Old Elko Golf Site was acquired for the Elko facility; and the Board of Regents adopted a transfer policy, first for the Elko Community College and later extended to all Community College Division campuses, that "allows any student graduated...in an associate of arts or associate of science program to be admitted to either UNR or UNLV as a regular student in a baccalaureate program with transfer credit granted for those courses which are equivalent to those offered in the baccalaureate programs at the universities."[7] And, on May 27, 1970, the Elko Community College held its first commencement exercises and awarded three associate in arts degrees, four associate in applied science degrees, and three adult high school diplomas.

Speaking before the 1971 Legislature, Governor O'Callaghan proposed continued support of the Elko Community College and recommended the necessary "legislative action required to open similar schools in Clark County and western Nevada." The governor indicated that while "there would seem justification for greater acceleration in this area," his proposal was "for slow and orderly development to avoid any possibility of duplication with our 4-year institutions."

Also in January 1971, the Board of Regents adopted a study prepared by Dr. Charles Donnelly and Leon H. Van Doren of the Community College Division titled, "State Plan for Community Colleges in the State of Nevada." In presenting the plan to the Board of Regents, Dr. Donnelly noted that by passing the plan the Regents would be "leading the way for the establishment of a statewide educational system designed to permit all of the people of this state to partake of higher education, regardless of age, grade point average, or family wealth."[8] This study set forth the following philosophy and principles:

---

7 Board of Regents, Meeting Minutes, June 12, 1970; extended to other campuses July 16-17, 1971.

8 Board of Regents, Meeting Minutes, January 7-8, 1971, p. 133.

1. Community colleges subscribe to an open-door policy of admitting any high school graduate or any adult who is capable of profiting from continuing education.

2. Community colleges believe in a system designed to pass students rather than one designed to fail students. Standards should be set for each course and program and if a student cannot meet this standard, he should be allowed to try some other course or program without penalty.

3. The community colleges established in this state should remain two-year colleges and not become four-year colleges.

4. Community colleges should be comprehensive in nature offering occupational, university parallel, community services, and developmental programs with broad counseling and guidance services available.

5. The goal of community colleges is to have 60 percent of the students enrolled in occupational programs.

6. All post-secondary technical education at the two-year level in Nevada should be offered by the community colleges.

7. The community colleges in Nevada will encourage their students to complete two-year programs at the community college before considering transfer to a university.

8. The goal of the community college division is to make the services of community colleges available to all people in all sections of the state.

9. In order to meet the manpower needs of the state, two new community colleges should be established in Clark County and Western Nevada to open on August 30, 1971.

10. The maximum size of any community college in the state should be 5,000 full-time equated students.

11. Elko Community College should provide services to the following counties; Elko, Humboldt, Lander, Eureka and White Pine. Clark County Community College should provide services to the following counties: Clark, Lincoln, Nye, and Esmeralda. Western Nevada Community College should provide services to the following counties: Washoe, Pershing, Churchill, Mineral, Lyon, Douglas, Storey, and Carson City.

12. Community college graduates should be accepted at the state universities with full transfer rights as juniors and should be given priority in admission.

13. The community colleges wish to be accredited solely by the Northwest Association. Accrediting by specialized agencies should be discouraged but voluntary cooperation with these agencies encouraged.

14. The cost of a community college education in Nevada to a student should be kept at as low a level as possible.[9]

The Community College Division plan estimated that the community college system could, with legislative approval of colleges in Clark County and western Nevada, serve 2,200 FTE students during the 1971-72 school year--200 at Elko, 1,250 in Clark County, and 750 in western Nevada. By 1979-80, total enrollment was estimated at 7,050 FTE students--350 in Elko, 4,000 in Clark County, and 2,700 in western Nevada.

The study recommended, and the Board of Regents requested, funding for the anticipated 1971-73 enrollment at the rate of $1,300 per FTE. The governor's budget request to the legislature recommended the requested budget at Elko Community College, but recommended substantially less funds than requested at the proposed Clark County and Western Nevada Community Colleges based on much lower enrollment projections. The legislature endorsed the governor's "slow and orderly" development approach and appropriated state funds for 1971-73, totaling $1,829,682, instead of the Regents' requested $5,126,100 to the infant Community College Division.

---

9 Community College Division, University of Nevada System; "State Plan for Community Colleges in the State of Nevada;" Adopted January 7, 1971; pp. 113-115.

The 1971 Legislature also initiated the community college capital improvement program by providing state funds for an instruction building, phase I, at the Elko Community College, by providing for the transfer of up to 200 acres of state land adjacent to Carson City to the Regents for construction of a community college, and by providing for the receipt and expenditure of funds should the Federal Government allow the states a credit against the federal slot machine tax. This last measure--Assembly Bill 459--created the higher education capital construction fund and provided that, if the federal slot tax rebate became effective, the first $5 million collected annually would be deposited into this fund for the purpose of constructing capital improvement projects for the UNS. The measure further provided that if there were sufficient moneys in the higher education capital construction fund, they would be used to construct instructional buildings on the three community college campuses--Clark ($1,889,000), Western Nevada ($1,330,000) and Elko ($719,000).

During the spring of 1972, federal legislation was approved allowing the state an 80 percent credit, or $200, on the federal tax on coin operated gaming devices. Since the credit became effective July 1, 1972, and the tax is due and payable prior to the beginning of the fiscal year, state collection of the slot tax credit began in May 1972, with the proceeds being credited to the state's 1971-72 fiscal year. These deposits "triggered" the projects authorized by A.B. 459, 1971 session, and construction was started on the instructional buildings on the three community college campuses. As previously noted, land for community college sites was acquired in Elko in 1970 and in Carson City as a result of 1971 legislation. In January 1972, the Board of Regents accepted 80 acres from the City of North Las Vegas for the location of the Clark County Community College. With land acquired through community effort, each subsequent session of the legislature since 1971 approved additional capital improvement projects at the three campuses, with much of the construction being financed from either the proceeds of the slot tax credit or the state's general fund. Table I (pages 14 and 15) summarizes these construction projects, totaling over $24.8 million, by legislative session and by funding source.

In the fall of 1971, both Clark County Community College and Western Nevada Community College opened their doors; and while Western Nevada's FTE enrollment was only 30 students less than

TABLE I

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS: COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

	Project	Cost	Fund Source
I.	**1971 Legislative Session:**		
A.	Instruction Building, N.N.C.C.	$ 90,000	U.R.B.
		375,000	G.F.
		31,000	A.F.
		118,519	F.F.
		$ 614,519	
B.	Instruction Building, C.C.C.C.	$ 1,889,000	H.E.C.C.
C.	Instruction Building, W.N.C.C.	$ 1,330,000	H.E.C.C.
		15,000	A.F.
		$ 1,345,000	
D.	Instruction Building, N.N.C.C., Phase II	$ 719,000	H.E.C.C.
		11,000	A.F.
		$ 730,000	
II.	**1973 Legislative Session:**		
A.	C.C.C.C., Phase II & III	$ 3,928,000	H.E.C.C.
		2,209,500	G.F.*
		90,000	A.F.
		$ 6,227,500	
B.	W.N.C.C., Phase II	$ 2,070,000	H.E.C.C.
		95,932	A.F.
		55,804	L.F.
		$ 2,221,736	
C.	N.N.C.C., Furniture	$ 134,154	G.F.
III.	**1975 Legislative Session:**		
A.	N.N.C.C. Lighting/Parking	$ 14,400	G.F.
B.	C.C.C.C., Phase II & III, Supplement	1,879,200	G.F.
		275,000	A.F.
		$ 2,154,200	
	Reallocated by SCR 16, 1977 Session	(313,000)	
		$ 1,841,200	
C.	W.N.C.C., Phase II, Supplemental	$ 765,000	G.F.
		100,000	A.F.
		$ 865,000	

TABLE I

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS: COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

	Project	Cost	Fund Source
I.	**1971 Legislative Session:**		
A.	Instruction Building, N.N.C.C.	$ 90,000	U.R.B.
		375,000	G.F.
		31,000	A.F.
		118,519	F.F.
		$ 614,519	
B.	Instruction Building, C.C.C.C.	$ 1,889,000	H.E.C.C.
C.	Instruction Building, W.N.C.C.	$ 1,330,000	H.E.C.C.
		15,000	A.F.
		$ 1,345,000	
D.	Instruction Building, N.N.C.C., Phase II	$ 719,000	H.E.C.C.
		11,000	A.F.
		$ 730,000	
II.	**1973 Legislative Session:**		
A.	C.C.C.C., Phase II & III	$ 3,928,000	H.E.C.C.
		2,209,500	G.F.*
		90,000	A.F.
		$ 6,227,500	
B.	W.N.C.C., Phase II	$ 2,070,000	H.E.C.C.
		95,932	A.F.
		55,804	L.F.
		$ 2,221,736	
C.	N.N.C.C., Furniture	$ 134,154	G.F.
III.	**1975 Legislative Session:**		
A.	N.N.C.C. Lighting/Parking	$ 14,400	G.F.
B.	C.C.C.C., Phase II & III, Supplement	1,879,200	G.F.
		275,000	A.F.
		$ 2,154,200	
	Reallocated by SCR 16, 1977 Session	(313,000)	
		$ 1,841,200	
C.	W.N.C.C., Phase II, Supplemental	$ 765,000	G.F.
		100,000	A.F.
		$ 865,000	

TABLE I

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS: COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM (Continued)

IV. 1977 Legislative Session:

	Project	Cost	Fund Source
A.	W.N.C.C., Phase III	$ 4,285,000	H.E.C.C
		2,200,000	U.R.B.
		418,000	C.I.F.F
		$ 6,903,000	
B.	W.N.C.C., Carson	$ 1,383,000	H.E.C.C
C.	W.N.C.C., Carson, Landscape	$ 92,000	H.E.C.C
D.	N.N.C.C., Improvements	$ 126,000	H.E.C.C
E.	C.C.C.C., Dental Program	$ 134,100	H.E.C.C
F.	C.C.C.C., Shop Building	$ 313,000	G.F.
	Total Capital Improvements	$24,833,609	

Legend:

U.R.B. - University Revenue Bonds
G.F. - General Fund
A.F. - Agency Funds
F.F. - Federal Funds
L.F. - Local Funds Contributed
H.E.C.C. - Higher Education Capital Construction Funds (Slot Tax Credit)
C.I.F.F. - Capital Improvement Fee Funds

* A general fund loan repayable from any balance in or receipts into the Higher Education Capital Construction Fund on or after July 1, 1977.

Source: Public Works Board

the projected 240 FTE students, Clark County's total enrollment was only 163 FTE students compared to the anticipated 340 FTE students. However, by the fall of 1972, the community college concept had apparently taken root, for enrollments at both Clark County Community College and Western Nevada Community College greatly exceeded those estimated in the 1971-73 Executive Budget. Also, in 1972, the Regents, expanding on their earlier transfer policy, adopted an extensive policy statement for the transfer of students from the campuses of the Community College Division to the two university divisions and established a four-member--president from UNR, UNLV, and the Community College Division and the chancellor or his designee--articulation board to review and evaluate current articulation policies and to formulate additional policies as needed. This policy statement assumed that "community colleges and university divisions should have equal social and academic status within the total university system" and that "articulation policies and procedures should be sufficiently developed to promote the smoothest flow of students between the participating institutions."[10] The transfer policy provided that all university parallel courses be accepted for transfer and that nonuniversity parallel courses may be accepted at the discretion of the necessary institution. Prior to accreditation, the community colleges were to "establish university parallel courses according to the course description and outlines in existence at either university division."[11] After accreditation, this procedure was "highly desirable" but not to be "interpreted to restrict innovation or the development of new courses or curricula at the community colleges."[12]

Budget planners had similar enrollment projection problems during the 1973-75 biennium when community college enrollments once again exceeded their growth estimates. By 1975, Clark County Community College was serving 2,324 FTE students while it was budgeted to serve 1,470 and Western Nevada Community College was serving 1,541 FTE students while its budget called for 1,100. However, during the 1975-77 biennium, the growth rate had slowed and both campuses were serving fewer students than called for in the Executive Budget. The 1977 Legislature, faced with differing enrollment projections at Clark County

---

10 University of Nevada System; "Proposed Community College/University Articulation Policy: Revised Draft January 20, 1972;" p. 1.

11 Ibid, p. 5

12 Ibid

Community College, established an enrollment reserve account, under control of the state Board of Examiners, to provide funds for an additional 300 FTE students in 1978-79, based on the actual enrollment experience during 1977-78. Table II (page 18) depicts UNS actual enrollments, by educational unit, since fiscal year 1969-70 and, for comparison purposes, also depicts the projected enrollment upon which the unit's legislatively approved budget was based.

Tables III (page 19) and IV (page 20) illustrate the growth in resources which have been available to the community college system since 1969-70. Table III details the amount of state general funds appropriated for the support of Nevada's community college system since 1969-70; and Table IV depicts the community colleges' legislatively approved operating budgets--composed of state general funds, student fees, federal vocational-education moneys, and other miscellaneous revenues available to the community colleges--since 1969-70. Both tables illustrate the explosive growth in resources that have been made available to Nevada's community college system since the initial effort in Elko in the late 1960's.

III. SUBCOMMITTEE METHODOLOGY

In order to conduct the study assigned by A.C.R. 44, the Legislative Commission allocated a budget of $6,088 to provide for the cost of meetings and the printing of a final report. To conduct the study the Legislative Commission appointed Assemblyman Thomas J. Hickey (Las Vegas) as subcommittee chairman, Senator James I. Gibson (Henderson) as subcommittee vice chairman, Senator Gary A. Sheerin (Capital District), Senator Norman D. Glaser (Northern Nevada), Senator William J. Raggio (Washoe), Assemblyman D. Roger Bremner (Clark), Assemblyman R. Ian Ross (Clark), Assemblyman Nash M. Sena (Clark), and Assemblyman John Serpa (Pershing-Churchill), as subcommittee members.

The subcommittee held its initial meetings on October 18, 1977, and October 19, 1977, on the campus of the Clark County Community College. Subsequent hearings were held on December 9, 1977, on the campus of the Northern Nevada Community College at Elko, and on April 28, 1978, on the Western Nevada Community College/North campus at Reno. These four meetings were devoted to subcommittee organization, a review of community college facilities, and public hearings, with all meetings being posted in compliance with the open meeting law, press releases being circulated to the news media throughout the state on the nature and scope of the meetings, and letters of invitation being sent to university and community college officials and other individuals interested in the Community College Division. At these

TABLE II

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM FTE STUDENT ENROLLMENT: PROJECTED AND ACTUAL

	University of Nevada, Reno	University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Clark Community College	Northern Nevada Community College	Western Nevada Community College
1969-70:					
Projected	5,620	3,485		150	
Actual	5,716	3,461		182	
1970-71:					
Projected	6,055	4,090		175	
Actual	6,249	3,860		207	
1971-72:					
Projected	6,415	4,250	340	225	240
Actual	6,500	4,295	163	208	210
1972-73:					
Projected	6,745	4,585	430	225	295
Actual	5,978	4,495	773	133	517
1973-74:					
Projected	6,290	4,980	1,100	175	800
Actual	5,753	4,358	1,321	197	1,452
1974-75:					
Projected	6,405	5,280	1,470	200	1,100
Actual	6,079	4,850	2,324	260	1,541
1975-76:					
Projected	6,641	5,495	2,900	250	2,100
Actual	6,204	5,097	2,569	333	1,825
1976-77:					
Projected	6,876	5,925	3,400	260	2,500
Actual	6,050	5,158	2,646	335	1,963
1977-78:					
Projected	6,394	5,677	3,000	360	2,310
Actual	5,904	5,242	2,544	341	1,967
1978-79:					
Projected	6,569	6,056	3,000**	370	2,574
Actual					

Sources: Enrollment projections from Executive Budget for 1969-71, 1971-73, 1973-75, 1975-77, and 1977079. Actual enrollment figures from University of Nevada System Comprehensive Plan 1975-79, University of Nevada System Comprehensive Plan for Public Higher Education in Nevada 1977-1981, University of Nevada 1977-78 Work Program, and 1977-78 actuals from Chancellor's Office. Projections until 1977-78 and actuals until 1976-77 are fall gross FTE, thereafter both are net annual FTE.

** Additionally, a reserve under the control of the State Board of Examiners was established to provide for an additional 300 FTE students should enrollment increase.

TABLE III

GENERAL FUND OPERATING AND "ONE-SHOT" APPROPRIATIONS - COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
Community College Administration	$	$	$ 93,500	$ 98,000	$ 181,478
Northern Nevada Community College	150,000	175,000	174,200	199,500	392,926
Clark Community College			305,000	590,300	1,668,066
Clark Community College Reserve					
Western Nevada Community College			164,253	204,929	1,134,826
Western Nevada Community College Books					
Total Community College	$ 150,000	$ 175,000	$ 736,953	$ 1,092,729	$ 3,377,296
Total University & WICHE	$14,813,857	$ 18,053,316	$ 17,511,688	$ 19,330,733	$ 23,753,1
Total Higher Education	$14,963,857	$ 18,228,316	$ 18,248,641	$ 20,423,462	$ 27,130,484
Total Operating and "One-Shot" Appropriations	$83,973,391	$101,082,273	$107,398,143	$121,008,972	$137,473,298

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
Community College Administration	$ 189,693	$ 325,098	$ 340,012	$ 65,188	$ 66,052
Northern Nevada Community College	460,636	493,281	533,773	620,441	673,870
Clark Community College	2,315,060	2,882,306	3,418,037	3,335,122	3,617,072
Clark Community College Reserve					155,505
Western Nevada Community College	1,570,320	1,941,936	2,385,438	2,817,211	3,178,880
Western Nevada Community College Books	200,000				
Total Community College	$ 4,735,709	$ 5,642,621	$ 6,677,260	$ 6,837,962	$ 7,691,3..
Total University & WICHE	$ 26,328,103	$ 32,650,403	$ 39,729,475	$ 40,091,240	$ 44,075,591
Total Higher Education	$ 31,063,812	$ 38,293,024	$ 46,406,735	$ 46,929,202	$ 51,766,970
Total Operating and "One-Shot" Appropriations	$157,097,563	$188,020,126	$201,776,450	$220,061,039	$241,476,950

Note: Salary adjustment appropriations are reported under University Total and are not distributed to Community College System appropriation areas.

TABLE IV

LEGISLATIVE APPROVED OPERATING BUDGET - COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
Community College Administration	$	$	$ 93,500	$ 98,000	$ 181,478
Northern Nevada Community College	150,000	175,000	260,000	292,500	434,926
Clark Community College			442,000	759,000	1,932,066
Clark Community College Reserve					
Western Nevada Community College			244,013	300,329	1,326,826
Western Nevada Community College Books					
Total Community College	$ 150,000	$ 175,000	$ 1,039,513	$ 1,449,829	$ 3,875,29
Total University & WICHE	$19,977,016	$ 23,648,624	$ 22,908,532	$ 24,919,577	$ 30,536,556
Total Higher Education	$20,127,016	$ 23,823,624	$ 23,948,045	$ 26,369,406	$ 34,411,852

	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
Community College Administration	$ 189,693	$ 325,098	$ 340,012	$ 65,188	$ 66,052
Northern Nevada Community College	508,636	573,561	618,033	760,971	817,120
Clark Community College	2,667,860	3,780,566	4,448,457	4,317,822	4,602,772
Clark Community College Reserve					155,505
Western Nevada Community College	1,834,320	2,627,436	3,161,268	3,626,331	4,060,808
Western Nevada Community College Books	200,000				
Total Community College	$ 5,400,509	$ 7,306,661	$ 8,567,770	$ 8,770,312	$ 9,702,25
Total University & WICHE	$ 33,087,682	$ 40,753,256	$ 48,034,537	$ 49,980,968	$ 54,300,423
Total Higher Education	$ 38,488,191	$ 48,059,917	$ 56,602,307	$ 58,751,280	$ 64,002,680

meetings testimony was provided by state legislators, University of Nevada System Regents, the chancellor of the UNS, the three presidents of the Community College Division, community college faculty members, members of community college advisory boards, local school superintendents, students, the chairman of the UNS' articulation board, and other individuals interested in Nevada's community colleges. The subcommittee also reviewed previous studies which had been done on community college education in the State of Nevada, facility utilization data provided by the chancellor's office, and other material relating to community college education.

Additionally, the subcommittee heard a presentation and reviewed the work of the consulting firm of Tadlock Associates, Incorporated. This consulting firm was engaged by the Board of Regents in October 1977, for a fee not to exceed $50,000, to determine additional community college facility needs. The consulting fee was funded by $30,000 from community college capital improvement fee funds and $20,000 from the Board of Regents' special projects fund. The consultant's reports were reviewed by subcommittee members during May and June, 1978, and the consultant made a presentation on the results of his studies to the subcommittee during a work session on June 9, 1978. At the same meeting, the manager of the state Public Works Board provided the subcommittee with a progress report on the board's community college facility study.

In addition to the four days of public hearings held on the community college campuses, the subcommittee met in a work session in the legislative building in Carson City on June 9, 1978. In addition to reviewing the results of the Tadlock study, this meeting was devoted to the subcommittee's formulation of study recommendations.

IV. SUBCOMMITTEE FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A. Organization of Nevada's Community Colleges

During the course of hearings, a great deal of testimony was provided to the subcommittee on the organization of Nevada's community colleges. Throughout, the subcommittee was continually aware of the constitutional status and authority of the University of Nevada System. As previously indicated, a January 10, 1968, Attorney General's opinion indicated that:

> It is our opinion that the control of all tax-supported education on a college level has been entrusted to the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada by the Constitution of this State. The establishment of other such tax-supported institutions of higher education by the Legislature that would not be under the control of the Board of Regents in all executive and administrative matters would be an unconstitutional legislative invasion and usurpation of the authority of the Board of Regents of the University of Nevada.[13]

However, the subcommittee also was aware of earlier opinions by the Legislative Counsel that differed from the opinion expressed by the Attorney General in 1968. These earlier opinions were reaffirmed in an April 21, 1978, Legislative Counsel opinion to one of the members of the study subcommittee, which indicated that:

> * * * we reaffirm our conclusion that community colleges fall into the optional category of educational institutions governed by the provisions of section 5 of article 11. Thus their establishment and operation are in the hands of the legislature, and the legislature may choose to keep them completely separate from the university and the board of regents.
>
> Nothing in the constitution requires that community colleges be controlled by the regents or prohibits the establishment of a separate and independent governing body for community colleges. In fact, as we mentioned above, Elko Community College was governed by a board of trustees consisting of the local school district trustees until July 1, 1969. Legislative placement of the community colleges under the board of regents was a matter of legislative policy, not the result of any constitutional mandate.

---

13 Opinions of the Attorney General, July 1, 1967 - June 30, 1968; Opinion Number 479; p. 128.

separation indicated that it would cost approximately $1/2 million each year for the community colleges to duplicate the central computing section alone. One individual associated with the Arizona state college board indicated to the subcommittee that the Community College Division in Nevada is too small at the present time to warrant the cost of two separate boards.

Proponents of separation maintained that the community college system should be autonomous because its educational philosophies are so dramatically different than those found in either the K-12 system or the university system. They felt that this "philosophical conflict" had been destructive to the University of Nevada System and that one method of maintaining the Community College Division's identity was to provide the community college system with a separate governing board.

The first draft report provided by Tadlock Associates, Incorporated (TAI), to the Board of Regents stated that:

> TAI recommends that the state <u>not</u> rely solely on the good faith and intent of the present university and community college officers to make the current system work. Personnel change rapidly in higher education and other officers may not be so understanding of the role and needs of the community college system. What is currently lacking is an organizational structure which undergirds the community colleges and provides the long term stability which reliance on individuals cannot provide the state.
>
> The most obvious solution, and in TAI's opinion the best <u>long term</u> solution, would require major changes in the system and a constitutional amendment. This solution would be the creation of a separate state level community college board with a state chancellor to serve as their executive officer. The local colleges would exist as autonomous units controlled by local boards of trustees and local presidents operating within policies,

> Thus it is our opinion that the legislature may establish a separate governing board for community colleges, just as it could (and did) establish the colleges themselves, without a constitutional amendment.
>
> *
>
> The legislature may remove governance of the community colleges from among the duties of the board of regents, but it does not have the power to require the regents to accept community college credits at the university.[14]

During the course of the subcommittee's public hearings, several members of the Board of Regents and university and community college officials indicated that it would be unwise to separate the Community College Division from the University of Nevada System. These individuals represented that Nevada has a very simple, direct and efficient system of community college education, and that centralization under one board solves many problems that other states simply cannot solve because of their fragmented organizational structures. They also expressed the opinion that control by a single Board of Regents significantly reduces the level of competition between the Community College Division and the two universities and that separation would result in jeolousy, friction and open competition between the community colleges and the universities before the legislature and the legislative money committees.

Additionally, it was stressed that the chancellor's office, under a University of Nevada System concept, provides a number of services to the universities and to the community colleges which, were the community colleges to be separated, would have to be duplicated in the Community College Division. These services were enumerated as being legal services, architectural staff which act as a liaison to the state Public Works Board, an internal audit staff, a planning and budget staff, and a central computing section. Opponents of

---

14 Legislative Counsel Opinion Number 48; April 21, 1978; Appendix B.

guidelines, and funding established by the state board. The State of Washington provides a good model for such a system which balances local and state control.[15]

The second draft report by the Tadlock study group which was submitted to the Board of Regents on May 26, 1978, dropped this particular language and indicated that there were several steps that the Board of Regents could take, if they elected to maintain the existing organizational structure, to make the current structure more effective for the community colleges. These recommended changes would "help create a climate where community colleges can establish their own identity, their own patterns of staffing, budgeting, and instruction, and their own philosophy of education."[16] The recommended changes would include continuing the practice of appointing local advisory boards for each community college district with representation from each service area, the appointment of a Board of Regents' Committee for Community Colleges to handle the community college portion of each Regents' agenda and submit recommendations for final approval to the full Board of Regents, and the appointment of a full-time staff officer reporting to the chancellor with specific responsibility for coordinating community college matters. The study further recommended that "when the population of the state increases to the point where even this augmented organizational system is unsatisfactory, then Nevada should consider designing a state level community college board."[17]

Subcommittee Finding:

The subcommittee finds that, while the legal basis exists to statutorily separate the Community College Division from the University of Nevada System,

---

15 Tadlock Associates, Inc.; Educational Plan for the University of Nevada System Community College Division; First Draft; April 1978; p. 17.

16 Tadlock Associates, Inc.; Educational Plan for the University of Nevada System Community College Division; Second Draft; April 1978; p. 19.

17 Ibid, p. 20.

making such a separation, at this time, would be premature. The subcommittee feels that such a radical organizational move, at this point, while not as costly as indicated to the subcommittee by those opposed to separation, would not be in the best interests of Nevada's educational system. In light of strong, negative testimony on the Regents' handling of community college affairs, the subcommittee reaffirms the importance of community college education in the State of Nevada and recommends that the Board of Regents take strong, positive actions to relieve the apprehensions of those who feel that the community colleges are being treated as a "step-child" of the two universities'.

The subcommittee also heard considerable testimony on the Board of Regents' termination of Dr. Donnelly as president of the Community College Division and the Regent's elimination of the central office of Community College Division president. As noted in the introduction, the Legislative Commission, meeting in July 1977, took formal action to convey its surprise to the Board of Regents over the board's decision to abolish the position of president of the Community College Division. Similar surprise was expressed by community college administrators, community college faculty members, and members of the public interested in community college affairs.

Subcommittee Finding:

The subcommittee recommends that the Board of Regents reinstitute the central office of president of the Community College Division. The subcommittee feels that the recommendation of Tadlock Associates, Incorporated that a full-time staff officer reporting to the chancellor with specific responsibility for coordinating community college matters does not provide sufficient independence and stature for the Community College Division. The subcommittee recommends that a president, having direct access to the Board of Regents in a manner similar and equal to the presidents of the University of Nevada at Reno and the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, be appointed to head the Community College Division. The subcommittee feels that the present system of three community college presidents does not provide for sufficient cohesiveness and independence for the Community College Division.

Throughout the subcommittee's hearings, members of the local community college advisory boards appeared before the subcommittee to indicate that they felt that their input to the Board of Regents was minimal and often neglected. Several members felt that the advisory boards were not consulted sufficiently on the development of community college programs and budgets and that their advice was not solicited in matters of local concern. One advisory board member indicated that he felt that the Regents tended to manipulate the advisory boards, and that the boards became extremely unpopular with the Regents when they became politically active.

Subcommittee Finding:

The subcommittee recognizes that an endeavor such as a community college system benefits from strong community support. One of the methods of obtaining this support is to use interested members of the community, who are not actively teaching or involved in the community college, to observe the functioning of the community college and to transmit the findings of their observations to the Board of Regents. The subcommittee feels that the Board of Regents should develop the necessary mechanisms, whether it be local advisory boards, a statewide advisory board, or a committee of the Board of Regents, to solicit both community advice and support.

B. Community College Facility Needs:

Advocates of additional community college facilities in the West Charleston area and Henderson area of Clark County and in the Fallon area of Churchill County appeared before the subcommittee at meetings in both Clark County and in Reno. These groups requested that the subcommittee make a recommendation to the 1979 Legislature that these three community college capital improvement projects--a $2,043,000 facility in Henderson, a $7,232,000 facility in the West Charleston area, and an $846,000 facility in the Fallon area--be reincorporated into the university's 1977-1981 capital improvement program. The advocates of new facilities in the West Charleston and Henderson area

both stressed the long commute distance that was involved for students in these areas in attending the present Clark County Community College campus in North Las Vegas. The advocates of a community college facility of approximatley 10,000 square feet in the Fallon area stressed that the Community College Division would lose the use of the existing Oats Park elementary school, a brick building containing 14 classrooms that was built in 1914, to the Churchill County school district in July 1979. In all cases, proponents of additional capital facilities were not requesting the creation of autonomous campuses; instead, they were requesting additional classrooms and laboratory facilities under the direction and control of the local community college.

Additionally, the subcommittee heard testimony from school district officials who pointed out that the joint use of facilities by the school district and the Community College Division has resulted in substantial dollar savings to the taxpayers. For example, the subcommittee heard that 72 percent of the classes which are presently operated by the Western Nevada Community College in Washoe County are operated in Washoe County School District facilities and that this represents approximately a $25 million capital investment that the state does not have to duplicate. The subcommittee also heard that such sharing of high school facilities is common in the rural areas. However, several individuals appearing before the subcommittee indicated that the use of non-owned facilities by the community colleges presents both a control and a support problem to community college administrators. The problem appears to be more acute in the acquisition of facilities for conducting vocational-technical courses where expensive shop and technical equipment and consumable supplies are involved. The problem apparently is not as great in the acquisition of general classroom facilities where the community college is simply acquiring classroom space and a blackboard.

Addressing community college facility needs, Tadlock Associates, Incorporated, observed that:

> All across the country, exciting and effective community colleges are attempting to move their operations off the campuses and into the communities they serve. A major consortium of these "community based" colleges have organized to further identify and utilize the resources of their communities and to promote the concept of reaching out to their clients. The earlier pattern of requiring the student to come to a central campus for all educational services is losing favor everywhere.
>
> The Nevada Community College Division, partly by design and partly by accident of a widely dispersed population, began using the community college as a resource from the system's inception. Storefront operations, in plant educational programs, and satellite programs in little towns far removed from urban centers became the norm.
>
> In TAI's estimation, accident or design, the system which has evolved makes sense and ought to be the building planning principle for the division. For some staff and for many community representatives, however, a highly visible comprehensive campus available in a community is the only proper college delivery system.
>
> This master plan is based on a more flexible system than the standard campus. It utilizes the community and its physical and human resources at the same time it delivers services. With only a limited dependence on fixed facilities, the college can respond almost immediately to a new educational need wherever it develops.[18]

In addressing the three proposed campuses, Tadlock recommended that the proposed campus sites in the West Charleston area and in the Henderson area should be reconsidered. They indicated that "The West Charleston area site would have a tendency to racially divide the two campuses with the increasing black and Chicano populations of North Las Vegas attending the Cheyenne campus, remaining north

---

[18] Ibid, p. 55.

of Highway 15." They further indicated that "One viable approach would be to locate existing facilities which may be available within easy commuting distance from the areas in southeastern Clark County" and further recommended that the Community College Division "investigate the possibility of obtaining or sharing the Southern Nevada Vocational Technical Center (SNVTC)."[19]

Addressing the proposed Fallon facility, Tadlock recommended that the Community College Division seek to acquire the current Oats Park elementary school site, but observed "that an additional facility for welding and automotive programs would still be required if this facility were transferred to the community college."[20] Should the Churchill County school district and the Community College Division not be able to reach agreement on the transfer of the Oats Park facility, Tadlock then recommended that the Community College Division either seek to lease open space in a local facility or seek public lands upon which to locate, on a lease plan, transportable facilities.

In evaluating the need for additional community college facilities, the subcommittee observed that there is a lack of meaningful data which conclusively demonstrates the need for additional community college physical plant expansion. For instance, the subcommittee reviewed the University of Nevada System's "Utilization of Instructional Space: Fall-1976" which was prepared by the chancellor's office in February 1977. Apparently because of data collection problems and difficulties in compiling the data for computer usage, an update of this Fall 1976 information was not available for the subcommittee's use. Information such as provided by this study, updated to account for current occupancy and lease practices, is necessary to make well informed, meaningful decisions on the need for additional capital facilities. Tadlock Associates, Incorporated observed similar difficulties in obtaining sound data on which to base recommendations:

> There is no doubt that the Nevada Community College System has suffered because it lacks a sound historical data base on enrollment, program effectiveness,

---

19 Ibid, p. 62.

20 Ibid, p. 59.

and facilities. The preparation of this study has been severely handicapped by the difficulties TAI has found in getting data in comparable terms. The problem is further compounded by omissions or discrepancies between campus and division records. Of course, the current administration is equally handicapped by this information weakness in the system.[21]

Subcommittee Finding:

The subcommittee finds that sufficient information and data have not been advanced to clearly demonstrate the need for additional community college capital facilities. The subcommittee feels that additional facility requests should be even more rigorously questioned in light of the slight decline in 1977-78 community college enrollments as displayed in Table 2 (page 18).

Additionally, the subcommittee endorses the "shared facility" concept as developed by Tadlock Associates, Incorporated. The subcommittee feels that greater use of existing facilities, whether they be publicly or privately owned, should be rigorously explored prior to the commitment of any additional funds for community college capital improvement projects. Aware of the problems in obtaining vocational-technical facilities, the subcommittee recommends that the community college explore the feasibility of joint investment with the school districts in the construction and/or acquisition of space for these purposes. Such joint investment could include the acquisition of vocational-technical equipment and supplies by the Community College Division, with building and space acquisition the responsibility of the participating school district. Such an arrangement could permit the community colleges to acquire vocational-technical teaching space during both the evening and the daytime hours.

C. The Utilization of Community College Resources:

At all four subcommittee meetings, the subcommittee heard testimony on student problems in transferring credits from the Community College Division to either the University of

---

21 Ibid, p. 5.

Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) or the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). Much of this testimony, from students and community college personnel, indicated that there were substantial problems in the transferring of course work from the community college system to the two universities and that, on some occasions, the net effect was that the taxpayer was paying twice for a student's education--once at the community college and once at the university. One community college student told the subcommittee that she had been told by community college counselors that certain course credits could be transferred to the university, but that when she transferred to the university, she found that the courses were not transferrable and that she had been erroneously advised of their transfer status by the counselors.

University administrators related to the subcommittee that most of the transfer problems that students have experienced are the result of courses taken several years and that transfer problems are currently under control and have largely been resolved by the University of Nevada System Articulation Board. This board has assisted in the implementation and the development of a master course file[22] which has become a common reference for community college courses and their transfer status. The master course file entries include the course number, the course title, the community college where the course is taught, and the transfer status of the course at UNR and UNLV. Before an entry is made regarding transfer status in the master file, a transfer status determination is requested of each university. Once this determination is made, the transfer status of a course is identified as equivalent, as a departmental elective, as a general elective, or as no transfer credit. The transfer status of courses is also designated in the community college catalogs so that students and advisers can be aware of the transfer status of a course before it is taken.

Subcommittee Finding:

The subcommittee agrees with university officials that the work of the University of Nevada System Articulation Board and the development of a master

---

22 An explanation of the master course file and articulation procedure is found in Appendix C.

course file has done much to alleviate transfer problems between the community college system and the two universities. The subcommittee is encouraged by the efforts that have been made to integrate community college course work into Nevada's higher education delivery system and feels that this successful integration is an important reason for maintenance of the existing unified community college - university organizational structure.

D. The Future Need for Community Colleges:

The "State Plan for Community Colleges in the State of Nevada," adopted by the Board of Regents on January 7, 1971, set forth 14 items of philosophy and principles to be used as guides in the development of the Nevada community college system. Five of these statements of philosophy are:

1. Community colleges should be comprehensive in nature offering occupational, university parallel, community services, and developmental programs with broad counseling and guidance services available.

2. Community colleges subscribe to an open-door policy of admitting any high school graduate or any adult who is capable of profiting from continuing education.

3. The community colleges established in this state should remain 2 year colleges and not become 4 year colleges.

4. The goal of the community colleges is to have 60 percent of the students enrolled in occupational programs.

5. The role of the community college division is to make the services of community colleges available to all people in all sections of the state.

In its analysis of material on the Community College Division, through testimony provided the subcommittee, and through onsite visitation, the subcommittee found that the Community College Division has fulfilled these goals and that they are still viable goals for the future operation of the division. Nevada's community colleges are

operating as 2 year colleges, the open-door policy still prevails as the Community College Division's admission policy, and community college course offerings are comprehensive in nature. Table V (page 35) illustrates community college enrollments for fiscal year 1975-76 and fiscal year 1976-77 by function and shows that the community colleges, with the understandable exception of the Northern Nevada Community College, are approximating the goal of having 60 percent of students enrolled in occupational programs. At the Northern Nevada Community College, because of its geographic isolation from the two universities and the attendant difficulties of students to pursue college level work in liberal arts, a larger percentage of the students are registered in nonvocational courses. The subcommittee recognizes this uniqueness and feels that the goal of having 60 percent of students enrolled in occupational courses at the Northern Nevada Community College would be unrealistic.

Because of the geographic and demographic characteristics of Nevada, the subcommittee is aware of the difficulty of making available educational services to people in all sections of the state. The subcommittee feels that the Community College Division has made commendable efforts in an attempt to deliver community college services throughout the state. The Northern Nevada Community College, with its main campus in Elko, operates educational programs in Ely, Winnemucca, Battle Mountain, Jackpot, McDermitt, Owyhee, and Wells. The Clark County Community College, with its main campus in North Las Vegas, operates educational programs at Nellis Air Force Base, in Henderson, Bonanza, Beatty, Indian Springs, Overton, and Tonopah. The Western Nevada Community College, with a main campus in the Reno/Sparks area and a secondary campus in Carson City, operates educational programs in Fallon, Hawthorne, and Yerington. In addition to courses offered in these main educational centers, the Community College Division provides course offerings at other locations throughout the state.

Table II (page 18) illustrates the explosive enrollment growth that the Community College Division has experienced. In its first year, 1971-72, of operation in three areas, the Community College Division had a total FTE enrollment of 581 students. By 1977-78, FTE enrollment had grown to 4,852 students. On a headcount basis, community college enrollments for the fall semester fiscal year 1977-78 were: Clark County Community College, 7,893

TABLE V

COMMUNITY COLLEGE ENROLLMENTS BY FUNCTION

FISCAL YEAR 1975-76

	CCCC	%	NNCC	%	WNCC	%	TOTAL	%
Liberal Arts	904.8	35.2	185.8	55.8	846.2	46.4	1,936.8	41.0
Agriculture			2.8	.8	1.5	.1	4.3	.1
Business	769.8	30.0	61.2	18.4	555.8	30.5	1,386.8	29.3
Industrial	180.3	7.0	40.3	12.1	78.1	4.3	298.7	6.3
Health	21	.8	5.4	1.6	73.5	4.0	99.9	2.1
Public Service	445.4	17.3	13.8	4.1	198.0	10.8	657.2	13.9
Developmental	247.7	9.7	23.7	7.2	71.9	3.9	343.3	7.3
Total	2,569.0	100 %	333.0	100 %	1,825.0	100 %	4,727.0	100 %

FISCAL YEAR 1976-77

	CCCC	%	NNCC	%	WNCC	%	TOTAL	%
Liberal Arts	1,266.6	47.9	207.7	62.0	898.6	45.8	2,372.9	48.0
Agriculture			9.6	2.9	1.5	.1	11.1	.2
Business	560.8	21.2	48.3	14.4	661.4	33.7	1,270.5	25.7
Industrial	352.7	13.3	35.8	10.7	84.4	4.3	472.9	9.6
Health	51.3	1.9	3.1	.9	70.0	3.6	124.4	2.5
Public Service	219.2	8.3	19.6	5.9	175.2	8.9	414.0	8.4
Developmental	195.4	7.4	10.9	3.2	771.9	3.6	278.2	5.6
Total	2,646.0	100 %	335.0	100 %	1,963.0	100 %	4,944.0	100 %

Note: Enrollments are net annual excluding community service credits.

Source: University of Nevada System.

students; Northern Nevada Community College, 1,199 students; and Western Nevada Community College, 7,269 students. This total community college headcount enrollment of 16,361 students compares favorably to a total combined headcount enrollment at UNR and UNLV of 16,651 students.

From the original graduating exercises in Elko in May 1970, where 3 associate of arts degrees, 4 associate of applied science degrees, and 3 adult high school diplomas were issued, the Community College Division in 1977-78 issued 177 one-year certificates, 510 associate degrees in either general studies, arts, or applied science, and 627 general education degrees.

Subcommittee Findings:

The subcommittee recognizes that the community college system has become an integral part of the state education system and feels that the original goals under which the Community College Division was established are still viable. The subcommittee feels that the statistics outlined in this report--enrollment figures, the amount of dollars allocated for community college operations and the amount of dollars made available for community college capital improvements--demonstrate legislative support and the public's acceptance of the community college concept. The subcommittee has confidence in the ability of the community colleges to successfully educate Nevada's citizens.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 9 1979

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES